

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In re Application of:**

Derderian et al.

**Serial No.:** 10/787,450

**Filed:** February 26, 2004

**For:** METHOD OF FORMING AN  
INTERFACE FOR A SEMICONDUCTOR  
DEVICE (AS AMENDED)

**Confirmation No.:** 7825

**Examiner:** J. Maldonado

**Group Art Unit:** 2823

**Attorney Docket No.:** 2269-4097.1US  
(97-1252.01/US)

**Notice of Allowance Mailed:**

March 22, 2007

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING  
JUNE 15, 2007

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Notice of Allowance mailed March 22, 2007, and sets forth Applicant's comments, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e), on the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance accompanying the Notice of Allowance.

In the Notice of Allowance, the Examiner indicates:

The primary reason for the allowance of the claims is the inclusion of the limitation "...providing an oxidation barrier over the non-titanium layer and within the hole..." in claim 27 and "...siliciding the titanium layer by exposing the semiconductor substrate to  $\text{TiCl}_4$  with a reactive gas and a carrier gas at a temperature about  $400^\circ\text{C}$  in a reaction chamber under a pressure of approximately 0.2 to 2 torr while an rf voltage is applied to the reaction chamber..." in claim 81 which is not found in the prior art references.

Applicants concur with the reasons as stated by the Examiner insofar as they comprise a summary, which is exemplary and not limiting. However, the scope of the claims is based on the actual language of the claims and equivalents thereof, and not on a paraphrase or summary of the claim language.

The Independent claims as allowed recite features and methodology in addition to, and in different language than, those described in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite elements in addition to those of the independent claims, which are also not reflected in the Statement of Allowable Subject Matter. Such additional elements, in combination with those of the independent claims from which each claim depends, provide additional reasons for patentability. Accordingly, the scope of the claims must be determined from the literal language of each as a whole, as well as all equivalents thereof.

Therefore, to the extent that the Examiner's reasons for allowance as stated are not relevant to, or wholly encompassing of, a particular claim, independent or dependent, Applicants assume that (pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e)) the Examiner has determined that the record of the prosecution as a whole of the application makes clear the reasons for allowing those claims. Further, it appears, pursuant to M.P.E.P. 1302.14, that the Examiner's Statements of Allowable Subject Matter are not intended to encompass all of the reasons for allowance.

**Serial No. 10/787,450**

Respectfully submitted,



Krista Weber Powell  
Registration No. 47,867  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: June 15, 2007  
KWP/nj:kwp  
Document in ProLaw